

REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 5-13, 15-25 are pending in the present application. Claims 1, 5, 6, 10, 15, 16 and 20 have been amended. Claims 4 and 14 have been canceled. No new matter has been added.

CLAIM REJECTIONS

35 U.S.C. §103

In paragraph 2 of the Office Action, Claims 1-3, 8-9, and 20-22 under 35 USC 103(a) are rejected as being unpatentable over U.S. patent 6,415,138 by Sirola et al. (referred to hereinafter as "Sirola") in view of U.S. patent 6,067,074 by Lueders (referred to hereinafter as "Lueders") and U.S. patent 5,955,198 by Hashimoto et al. (referred to hereinafter as "Hashimoto"). Independent Claims 1 and 20 have been amended to include "wherein said flexible touch sensor comprises a fabric," which is taken from Claim 4. Claim 4 was rejected in paragraph 4 of the Office Action under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sirola, Lueders, and Hashimoto in view of U.S. patent 6,438,498 by Colgan et al. (referred to hereinafter as "Colgan"). Applicant has reviewed Sirola, Lueders, Hashimoto, and Colgan, and respectfully submits that the embodiments of the present invention as recited in Claims 1-3, 8-9, and 20-22 are neither taught nor rendered obvious by Sirola, Lueders, and Hashimoto, taken alone or in combination.

Amended independent Claim 1 recites,

"A user interface for a portable electronic device, said user interface comprising:

- c) a flexible display panel, said flexible display panel forming a first layer of said user interface; and
- d) a flexible touch sensor coupled with said flexible display panel, said

flexible touch sensor forming a second layer of said user interface, wherein said flexible touch sensor is operable to register a position where contact is made with a surface of said user interface, wherein a particular position on said user interface is translated into a particular command controlling said portable electronic device, wherein said flexible touch sensor comprises a fabric."

To summarize, Claim 1 recites "A user interface for a portable electronic device, said user interface comprising: a) a flexible display panel ... b) a flexible touch sensor coupled with said flexible display panel..." In paragraph 2, the Office Action states that Simola teaches "a user interface ... comprising:... a touch sensor ... coupled with display panel..." The Office Action further states that "Simola et al. does not show flexible display panel. Lueders teaches flexible display..., and "Simola et al. and Lueders do not show flexible touch sensor. Hashimoto et al. teaches touch panel with flexible spacers..." However, assuming for the sake of argument that Simola teaches a user interface, Leuders teaches a flexible display panel, and Hashimoto teaches a flexible touch sensor, there is nothing in the references that show how to combine Simola, Leuders and Hashimoto to arrive at the claimed invention as recited in Claim 1. Further, Simola does not teach a user interface. Instead, Sirola teaches a wireless communications device, therefore, even if the references could be combined, the combination would not be the claimed invention as recited in Claim 1.

Further Claim 1 has been amended to includes the limitation " wherein said flexible touch sensor comprises a fabric." This limitation is supported in the specification in numerous places. This limitation is neither taught nor rendered obvious by Sirola, Lueders and Hashimoto, taken alone or in combination.

In paragraph 4, the rejection states that “Sirola et al., Lueders and Hashimoto do not show flexible touch sensor (fabric) disposed within flexible display panel, such that flexible touch sensor is internal to flexible display panel.” Applicant agrees with the rejection that neither Sirola, Lueders nor Hashimoto show a flexible touch sensor that is comprised of fabric.

The rejection further states in paragraph 4 that “Colgan et al. teaches display with integrated resistive touch sensor (see Fig. 2, items 24, 30, 26, in description See Col. 4, Lines 28 to Col 5. Line 40).” Although Colgan teaches a polarizer 24 that is adhered to a conductive layer 26 with spacer bumps 30, at Col. 5, lines 31-35, Colgan does not teach “wherein said flexible touch sensor comprises a fabric,” as Claims 1 and 20 recite. Further, the rejection does not even assert that Colgan teaches “wherein said flexible touch sensor comprises a fabric,” as Claims 1 and 20 recite.

The cited combination fails to teach or suggest this claim limitation because Colgan fails to remedy the deficiency in Simola, Leuders, and Hashimoto in that Colgan fails to teach or suggest, “wherein said flexible touch sensor comprises a fabric,” as recited by Claims 1 and 20. Further, assuming the combination could be implemented, there is no teaching or suggestion in the references to modify the references to realize the embodiments of the invention recited in Claims 1 and 20. In fact, the rejection does not even assert that the references provide a teaching or suggestion to modify the references.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of independent Claims 1

and 20 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) has been overcome and that independent Claims 1 and 20 are in condition for allowance.

Amended independent Claim 20, recites:

- “A method for providing a user interface for a portable computer system, said method comprising the steps of:
- d) displaying images and characters to a user via a flexible display panel;
 - e) receiving input via a flexible touch sensor, said flexible touch sensor operable to register a position where contact is made with a surface of said flexible display panel, wherein said flexible touch sensor comprises a fabric;
 - f) translating said input into a particular command for controlling said portable electronic device.”

It is respectfully submitted that Claim 20 is patentable over Simola, Lueders, Hashimoto and Colgan, alone or combination, for similar reasons that Claim 1 is patentable over Simola, Lueders, and Hashimoto, in that Claim 20 also recites “wherein said flexible touch sensor comprises a fabric.”

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of independent Claims 1 and 20 under 35, U.S.C. 9 103(a) has been overcome, and that independent Claims 1 and 20 are in condition for allowance. Additionally, Claims 2-9 are dependent on independent Claim 1 and Claims 21-25 are dependent on independent Claim 20. Accordingly, Applicant also respectfully submits that the rejection of Claims 2-9 and Claims 21-25 under 35 U.S.C. 9 103(a) has been overcome, as these claims are dependent on allowable base claims and recite

additional limitations.

CLAIM REJECTIONS

35 U.S.C. §103

In paragraph 3 of the Office Action, Claims 10-13 and 18-19 under 35 USC 103(a) are rejected as being unpatentable over U.S. patent 5,634,080 by Kikinis et al. (referred to hereinafter as "Kikinis") in view of Leuders and Hashimoto. Applicant has reviewed Kikinis, Lueders and Hashimoto, and respectfully submits that the embodiments of the present invention as recited in Claims 10-13 and 18-19 are neither taught nor rendered obvious by Kikinis, Lueders, and Hashimoto, taken alone or in combination.

Amended independent Claim 10 recites,

"A portable computer system comprising:

- f) a bus;
- g) a memory device coupled with said bus;
- h) a processor coupled with said bus;
- i) a flexible display panel coupled with said bus, said flexible display panel forming a first layer of a user interface; and
- e) a flexible touch sensor coupled with said flexible display panel, said flexible touch sensor forming a second layer of a user interface, wherein said flexible touch sensor comprises a fabric.."

Applicant respectfully states that Claim 10 includes the limitation " wherein said flexible touch sensor comprises a fabric." This limitation is supported in the specification in numerous places. This limitation is neither taught nor rendered obvious by Kikinis, Lueders, and Hashimoto, taken alone or in combination.

In paragraph 5, the rejection states that neither Kikinis, Leuders, nor Hashimoto show a flexible touch sensor that is comprised of fabric. Applicant agrees with the rejection that neither Kikinis, Leuders, nor Hashimoto show a flexible touch sensor that is comprised of fabric.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of independent Claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) has been overcome, and that independent Claim 10 is in condition for allowance. Additionally, Claims 11-19 are dependent on independent Claim 10. Accordingly, Applicant also respectfully submits that the rejection of Claims 11-19 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) has been overcome, as these claims are dependent on allowable base claims and recite additional limitations.

CLAIM REJECTIONS

35 U.S.C. §103

In paragraph 4 of the Office Action, Claims 4-5 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sirola, Lueders, and Hashimoto in view of Colgan. Claim 4 has been cancelled. Applicant respectfully states that Claims 1 and 20 include the limitation "wherein said flexible touch sensor comprises a fabric." This limitation is supported in the specification in numerous places. This limitation is neither taught nor rendered obvious by Sirola, Leuders, Hashimoto, and Colgan, taken alone or in combination.

As already presented herein, the cited combination fails to teach or suggest this claim limitation because Colgan fails to remedy the deficiency in Sirola, Leuders, and Hashimoto in that Colgan fails to teach or suggest, "wherein said flexible touch sensor comprises a fabric," as recited by Claims 1 and 20. Further,

assuming the combination could be implemented, there is no teaching or suggestion in the references to modify the references to realize the embodiments of the invention recited in Claims 1 and 20. In fact, the rejection does not even assert that the references provide a teaching or suggestion to modify the references.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of independent Claims 1 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) has been overcome and that independent Claims 1 and 20 are in condition for allowance. Additionally, Claim 5 depends on independent Claim 1, and Claim 23 depends on Claim 20. Accordingly, Applicant also respectfully submits that the rejection of Claims 5, and 23 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) has been overcome, as these claims are dependent on allowable base claims and recite additional limitations.

CLAIM REJECTIONS

35 U.S.C. §103

In paragraph 5 of the Office Action, Claims 14 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sirola, Lueders and Hashimoto in view of Colgan. Claim 14 has been cancelled. Applicant has reviewed Sirola, Lueders, Hashimoto, and Colgan, and respectfully submits that the embodiments of the present invention as recited in Claims 14 and 15 are neither taught nor rendered obvious by Sirola, Lueders, Hashimoto, and Colgan, taken alone or in combination. Applicant respectfully states that Claims 1 and 20 include the limitation "wherein said flexible touch sensor comprises a fabric." This limitation is supported in the specification in numerous places. This limitation is neither taught nor rendered obvious by Sirola, Leuders, Hashimoto, and Colgan, taken alone or in combination.

As already asserted herein, the cited combination fails to teach or suggest this claim limitation because Colgan fails to remedy the deficiency in Simola, Leuders, and Hashimoto, in that Colgan fails to teach or suggest, "wherein said flexible touch sensor comprises a fabric," as recited by Claims 1 and 20. Further, assuming the combination could be implemented, there is no teaching or suggestion in the references to modify the references to realize the embodiments of the invention recited in Claims 1 and 20. In fact, the rejection does not even assert that the references provide a teaching or suggestion to modify the references.

Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of independent Claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. 9 103(a) has been overcome, and that independent Claim 10 is in condition for allowance. Additionally, Claim 15 is dependent on independent Claim 10. Accordingly, Applicant also respectfully submits that the rejection of Claim 15 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) has been overcome, as these claims are dependent on

allowable base claims. Further, Claim 15 recites additional limitations which make it allowable. For example, since the cited references do not teach or suggest "wherein said flexible touch sensor comprises a fabric," as recited by Claim 10 the references cannot teach or suggest "said fabric is disposed within said flexible display panel," as recited by Claim 15.

CLAIM REJECTIONS

35 U.S.C. §103

In paragraph 6 of the Office Action, Claims 7 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sirola, Lueders, and Hashimoto in view of U.S. patent 6,256,009 by Lui et al. (referred to hereinafter as "Lui"). Applicant has reviewed Sirola, Lueders, Hashimoto, and Lui, and respectfully submits that the embodiments of the present invention as recited in Claims 7 and 25 are neither taught nor rendered obvious by Sirola, Lueders, Hashimoto, and Lui, taken alone or in combination. Applicant respectfully states that Claims 1 and 20 include the limitation "wherein said flexible touch sensor comprises a fabric." This limitation is supported in the specification in numerous places. This limitation is neither taught nor rendered obvious by Sirola, Lueders, Hashimoto, and Lui, taken alone or in combination.

The cited combination fails to teach or suggest this claim limitation because Lui fails to remedy the deficiency in Sirola, Leuders, and Hashimoto, in that Lui fails to teach or suggest, "wherein said flexible touch sensor comprises a fabric," as recited by Claims 1 and 20. Further, assuming the combination could be implemented, there is no teaching or suggestion in the references to modify the references to realize the embodiments of the invention recited in Claims 1 and 20. In fact, the rejection does not even assert that the references provide a teaching or suggestion

to modify the references.

Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of independent Claims 10 and 20 under 35U.S.C. S 103(a) has been overcome, and that independent Claims 1 and 20 are in condition for allowance. Additionally, Claim 7 is dependent on independent Claim 10, and Claim 25 is dependent on independent Claim 20. Accordingly, Applicant also respectfully submits that the rejection of Claims 7 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) has been overcome, as these claims are dependent on allowable base claims. Further, Claims 7 and 25 recite additional limitations which make them allowable.

CLAIM REJECTIONS

35 U.S.C. §103

In paragraph 7 of the Office Action, Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sirola and Lueders in view of Lui. Applicant has reviewed Sirola, Lueders, Hashimoto, and Lui, and respectfully submits that the embodiments of the present invention as recited in Claim 17 are neither taught nor rendered obvious by Sirola, Lueders, Hashimoto and Lui, taken alone or in combination.

As already asserted herein, Applicant respectfully states that Claims 1 and 20 include the limitation "wherein said flexible touch sensor comprises a fabric." This limitation is supported in the specification in numerous places. This limitation is neither taught nor rendered obvious by Sirola, Lueders, Hashimoto, and Lui, taken alone or in combination.

The cited combination fails to teach or suggest this claim limitation because Lui

fails to remedy the deficiency in Sirola, Leuders, and Hashimoto, in that Lui fails to teach or suggest, "wherein said flexible touch sensor comprises a fabric," as recited by Claims 1 and 20. Further, assuming the combination could be implemented, there is no teaching or suggestion in the references to modify the references to realize the embodiments of the invention recited in Claims 1 and 20. In fact, the rejection does not even assert that the references provide a teaching or suggestion to modify the references.

Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of independent Claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. S 103(a) has been overcome, and that independent Claim 10 is in condition for allowance. Additionally, Claim 17 is dependent on independent Claim 10. Accordingly, Applicant also respectfully submits that the rejection of Claim 17 under 35 U.S.C. S 103(a) has been overcome, as these claims are dependent on allowable base claims. Further, Claim 17 recites additional limitation which make it allowable.

CLAIM REJECTIONS

35 U.S.C. §103

In paragraph 8 of the Office Action, Claims 6 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sirola, Lueders, Hashimoto in view of U.S. patent 6,333,736 by Sandbach et al. (referred to hereinafter as "Sandbach"). Applicant has reviewed Sirola, Lueders, Hashimoto, and Sandbach, and respectfully submits that the embodiments of the present invention as recited in Claims 6 and 24 are neither taught nor rendered obvious by Sirola, Lueders, Hashimoto and Sandbach, taken alone or in combination.

Applicant respectfully states that Claims 1 and 20 include the limitation

"wherein said flexible touch sensor comprises a fabric." This limitation is supported in the specification in numerous places. This limitation is neither taught nor rendered obvious by Sirola, Lueders, Hashimoto, and Sandbach, taken alone or in combination.

The cited combination fails to teach or suggest this claim limitation because Sandbach fails to remedy the deficiency in Sirola, Leuders, and Hashimoto, in that Sandbach fails to teach or suggest, "wherein said flexible touch sensor comprises a fabric," as recited by Claims 1 and 20. Further, assuming the combination could be implemented, there is no teaching or suggestion in the references to modify the references to realize the embodiments of the invention recited in Claims 1 and 20. In fact, the rejection does not even assert that the references provide a teaching or suggestion to modify the references.

Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of independent Claims 1 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. S 103(a) has been overcome, and that independent Claims 1 and 20 are in condition for allowance. Additionally, Claim 6 is dependent on independent Claim 1 and Claim 24 is dependent on independent Claim 20. Accordingly, Applicant also respectfully submits that the rejection of Claims 6 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. S 103(a) has been overcome, as these claims are dependent on allowable base claims. Further, Claims 6 and 24 recite additional limitations which make them allowable. For example, since the cited references do not teach or suggest "wherein said flexible touch sensor comprises a fabric," as recited by Claim 1, the cited references cannot teach or suggest "said fabric comprises conductive fibers, said conductive fibers adapted to conduct electronic impulses responsive to said contact with said user interface," as recited by Claim 6.

CLAIM REJECTIONS

35 U.S.C. §103

In paragraph 9 of the Office Action, Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kirikis, Lueders and Hashimoto in view of Sandbach. Applicant has reviewed Kirikis, Lueders, Hashimoto, and Sandbach, and respectfully submits that the embodiments of the present invention as recited in Claim 16 are neither taught nor rendered obvious by Kirikis, Lueders, Hashimoto and Sandbach, taken alone or in combination.

Applicant respectfully states that Claims 1 and 20 include the limitation "wherein said flexible touch sensor comprises a fabric." This limitation is supported in the specification in numerous places. This limitation is neither taught nor rendered obvious by Kirikis, Lueders, and Hashimoto, and Sandbach, taken alone or in combination.

The cited combination fails to teach or suggest this claim limitation because Sandbach fails to remedy the deficiency in Kirikis, Lueders, and Hashimoto in that Sandbach fails to teach or suggest, "wherein said flexible touch sensor comprises a fabric," as recited by Claims 1 and 20. Further, assuming the combination could be implemented, there is no teaching or suggestion in the references to modify the references to realize the embodiments of the invention recited in Claims 1 and 20. In fact, the rejection does not even assert that the references provide a teaching or suggestion to modify the references.

Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of independent Claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) has been overcome, and that independent Claim 10 is in condition for allowance. Additionally, Claim 16 is dependent on independent Claim

10. Accordingly, Applicant also respectfully submits that the rejection of Claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) has been overcome, as this claim depends on an allowable base claim and recites additional limitations.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above listed amendments and remarks, reconsideration of the rejected Claims is requested. Based on the amendments and arguments presented above, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 1-25 overcome the rejections of record. Therefore, allowance of Claims 1-25 is earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner have a question regarding the instant response, the Applicant invites the Examiner to contact the Applicant's undersigned representative at the below listed telephone number.

Dated: Aug 17, 2004

Respectfully submitted,
WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP

Cheryl A. Eichstaedt
Cheryl A. Eichstaedt
Registration No. 50,761

Address:

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP
Two North Market Street
Third Floor

Telephone:

San Jose, California 95113
(408) 938-9060 Voice
(408) 938-9069 Facsimile